



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,927	02/27/2002	Gregory Eugene Perkins	100201141-1	1153

22879 7590 04/16/2008

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

04/16/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
mkraft@hp.com  
ipa.mail@hp.com



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/085,927  
Filing Date: February 27, 2002  
Appellant(s): PERKINS ET AL.

---

Jack H. McKinney  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 2/25/08 appealing from the Office action mailed 7/31/07.

Art Unit: 2100

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6490624	Sampson et al	12-2002
2003/0074580	Knouse et al	4-2003
2004/0015580	Lu et al	1-2004

**(9) Grounds of Rejection**

Art Unit: 2100

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claims 9, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility. When nonfunctional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium, in a computer or on an electromagnetic carrier signal, it is not statutory since no requisite functionality is present to satisfy the practical application requirement. Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material, i.e., abstract ideas, stored in a computer-readable medium, in a computer, on an electromagnetic carrier signal does not make it statutory. See *Diehr*, 450 U.S. at 185-86, 209 USPQ at 8.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the Appellant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the Appellant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an

Art Unit: 2100

application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-2, 5, 9-10, 13, 17-18, 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipate by U.S. Patent No. 6,490,624 to Sampson et al.

a. As per claims 1, 9 and 24, Sampson et al teaches a method for locating a resource, comprising: providing an interface (*browser*) having instructions to send association data (See col. 7, lines 64-65); identifying an identity service using the association data (See col. 7, lines 65, *Protected web server*), the identity service managing resource data; and locating the resource using the resource data (See col. 7, lines 66-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5).

b. As per claims 2 and 10, Sampson et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Sampson et al teaches performing a specified task utilizing the resource (See col. 6, lines 27-45).

c. As per claims 5 and 13, Sampson et al teaches a method for locating a resource for a user, comprising: providing an interface having instructions to send association data to two or more association services (See col. 13, lines 1-10 and col. 14, lines 44-52) identifying from the two or more association services, an association service with which the user has established a relationship (See col. 13, lines 6-17) identifying an identity service using the association data sent to the identified association service (See col. 13, lines 29-39) the identity service managing

Art Unit: 2100

resource data; and locating the resource using the resource data (See col. 7, lines 66-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5).

d. As per claims 17 and 24, Samson et al teaches a system for locating a resource, comprising: an association module operable to query an association service, supplying a session identifier, in order to identify an identity service managing resource data (See col. 10, lines 39-60) and an application operable to: provide an interface having instructions to send association data to the association service, the association data to contain a client identifier and a session identifier for the provided interface (See col. 10, lines 39-46) acquire resource data from an identity service identified by a query from the association module; and locate the resource using the resource data (See col. 7, lines 66-67 and col.8, lines 1-5).

e. As per claim 18, Samson et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Samson et al teaches wherein the application is further operable to provide the interface in the form of a web page having instructions to send association data containing a cookie and the URL for the provided web page (See col. 7, lines 64-65); and the association module is further operable to provide the URL and query the association service for an URL for the identity service (See col. 13, lines 1-17).

f. As per claim 20, Sampson et al teaches a system for locating a resource, comprising: an identity service operable to manage resource data (See col. 7, lines 65-67); an association server operable to receive association data containing a client identifier and a session identifier, save the

Art Unit: 2100

association data in an association table, and receive queries for the association table (See col. 9, lines 25-26 and Col. 13, lines 6-17); an association table interface in communication with the association server and operable, according to a received query, to access from the association table a session identifier for the identity service using a session identifier supplied with the query (See col. 9, lines 52-59 and col. 13, lines 6-17); an association module operable to query, supplying a session identifier, the association service in order to identify the identity service (See col. 13, lines 6-13, *the session manager object checks to determine whether the session Id is recognized or known*) an application operable to: provide an interface having instructions to send association data to an association server, the association data to contain a client identifier and a session identifier for the provided interface (See 10, lines 39-46) acquire resource data from the identity service identified by a query from the association module and locate the resource using the resource data (See col. 7, lines 66-67 and col. 8, lines 1-4).

g. As per claim 21, Knouse et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, Knouse et al teaches wherein: the application is further operable to provide the interface in the form of a web page having instructions to send association data containing a cookie and the URL for the provided web page (See page 19, paragraph [0217]); the association module is further operable to provide the URL interface and query the association service for an URL for the identity service (See page 13, paragraph [0159]); and the association table interface is further operable to locate an entry in the association table containing the provided URL, identify the cookie in the located entry, identify other entries containing that cookie, and, from those other entries, acquire an URL for the identity service (See page 13, paragraph [0156] and

Art Unit: 2100

page 17, paragraph [0202]); and the application is further operable to use the acquired URL to acquire resource data from the identity service (See page 13, paragraph [0159]).

h. As per claim 19 and 25, Sampson et al teaches a document production system, comprising: an association module operable to query an association service, supplying a session identifier in order to identify an identity service managing resource data (See col. 13, lines 1-17); and a document production application operable to: provide an interface having content for sending association data containing a session identifier for the provided interface to an association service as well as content for displaying controls for selecting production options (See col. 7, lines 16-21, col. 8, lines 1-5 and col. 13, lines 1-17); acquire resource data from an identity service identifier identified by a query from the association module (See col. 7, lines 64-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5); locate and access a document management service using the resource data; and provide, for the interface, additional content for displaying controls for selecting a document managed by the document management service; and produce a document according to selections made through the interface (See col. 7, lines 16-22).

i. As per claim 22, Sampson et al teaches a document production system, comprising: a document management service (See col. 6, lines 18-45); an identity service operable to manage resource data for locating and accessing the document management service (See col. 7, lines 64-67); an association server operable to receive association data containing a client identifier and a session identifier (See col. 10, lines 39-46), save the association data in an association table (See col. 9, lines 52-59), and receive queries for the association table (See col. 13, lines 1-17); an



Art Unit: 2100

association table interface in communication with the association server and operable, according to a received query, to access from the association table a session identifier for the identity service using the session identifier supplied with the query (See col. 13, lines 1-17); an association module operable to query, supplying a session identifier, the association service in order to identify the identity service (See col. 13, lines 1-17); a document production application operable to: provide an interface having content for sending association data containing a client identifier and a session identifier for the provided interface to an association service as well as content for displaying controls for selecting production options (see col. 16-22 and col. 7, lines 64-67); acquire resource data from an identity service using the session identifier for the identity service identified by a query from the association module (See col. 13, lines 1-16); locate and access the document management service using the resource data (See col. 7, lines 16-22); provide, for the interface, additional content for displaying controls for selecting a document managed by the document management service; and produce a document according to selections made through the interface (See col. 7, lines 16-22)

j. As per claim 23, Sampson et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, Sampson et al teaches wherein: the association table interface is further operable to locate an entry in the association table containing the session identifier supplied with a query, identify the client identifier in the located entry, identify other entries containing that client identifier, and, from those other entries, acquire a session identifier for the Identity service; and the document production application is further operable to use the acquired session identifier for the identity service to acquire resource data from the identity service (See col. 13, lines 1-40)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 3 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,490,624 to Sampson et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0074580 to Knouse et al.

a. As per claims 3 and 11, Sampson et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, Sampson et al teaches wherein the association data includes a client identifier and a session identifier associated with the interface (See col. 10, lines 39-46) and identifying wherein the act of identifying comprises: providing the session identifier associated with the interface, identifying the client identifier included in the association data (See col. 13, lines 17.) However, Sampson et al fails to teach identifying other association data containing that client identifier; and acquiring at least a portion of the session identifier included in the other association data.

Knouse et al teaches identifying other association data containing that client identifier; and acquiring at least a portion of the session identifier included in the other association data (See page 32, paragraph 0340]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Knouse et al in the claimed invention of Sampson et al in order to allow the user to access a second resource without requesting the user to provide additional credential for a full authentication (See page 33, paragraph [0340]).

9. Claims 4 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,490624 to Sampson et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0074580 to Knouse et al and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0015580 to Lu et al.

a. As per claims 4 and 12, Sampson et al teaches invention as described above. However, Knouse et al fails teaches providing a web page having instructions to request a web bug sending association data containing a cookie and an URL for the web page; wherein the act of providing comprises providing a web page having instructions to request a web bug sending association data containing a cookie and an URL for the web page; and wherein the act of identifying comprises; identifying other association data containing the cookie; and acquiring an URL for the identity service from the identified association data.

Lu et al teaches a system and method for generating and reporting cookie values at a client node. Furthermore, Lu et al teaches providing a web page having instructions to request a

Art Unit: 2100

web bug sending association data containing a cookie and an URL for the web page (See page 4, paragraph [0059]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lu et al in the claimed invention of Knouse et al in order to establish and process a cookie right on the client node without additional interaction with the web tracking provider (See page 4, paragraph [0064]). However, Sampson et al in view of Lu et al fails teach wherein the act of providing comprises providing a web page having instructions to request a web bug sending association data containing a cookie and an URL for the web page; and wherein the act of identifying comprises; identifying other association data containing the cookie; and acquiring an URL for the identity service from the identified association data.

Knouse et al teaches wherein the act of providing comprises providing a web page having instructions to request a web bug sending association data containing a cookie and an URL for the web page; and wherein the act of identifying comprises; identifying other association data containing the cookie; and acquiring an URL for the identity service from the identified association data (See page 17, paragraph [0204-0209])

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Knouse et al in the claimed invention of Sampson et al in view of Lu et al in order to in order to allow the user to access a second resource without requesting the user to provide additional credential for a full authentication (See page 33, paragraph [340]).

10. Claims 6 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0074580 to Knouse et al in view U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0015580 to Lu et al.

a. As per claims 6 and 14, Knouse et al teaches in a computer network, a method for locating a resource comprising; saving the cookie and the URL for the web page as an entry in an association table querying, providing the URL for the web page, the association table for the cookie in the entry containing the URL (See page 17, paragraph [0204]); identifying other entries in the association table containing the cookie (See page 17, paragraph [0209]; identifying from those entries an entry containing an URL for an identification service, the identification service managing resource data (See page 17, paragraph [0206-0209]); and locating the resource using the resource data (See page 13, paragraph [0159] and page 17, paragraph [0206-0209]). However, Knouse et al fails to teach providing a web page having instructions to request a web bug; requesting the web bug sending a cookie and an URL for the web page and saving the cookie and the URL for the web pages as an entry in an association table.

Lu et al teaches providing a web page having instructions to request a web bug; requesting the web bug sending a cookie and an URL for the web page and saving the cookie and the URL for the web pages as an entry in table (See page 4, paragraph [0059]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lu et al in the claimed invention of Knouse et al in order to establish and process a cookie right on the client node without additional interaction with the web tracking provider (See page 4, paragraph [0064]).

11. Claims 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,490,624 to Sampson et al in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0015580 to Lu et al.

a. As per claim 7 and 15, Sampson et al teaches producing an electronic document, comprising: generating, upon request from a user, content for displaying controls for selecting production options (See col. 7, lines 16-22, *the system presents the user with a personalized menu*); querying the association service to identify an identity service with which the user is registered providing an URL for the generated web page (See col. 7, lines 16-20, col. 7, lines 64-67 and col. 8, lines 1-5); obtaining the user's resource data from the identified identity service (See col. 7, lines 16-20 and col. 8, lines 1-5); locating and accessing a document management service using the resource data ; providing additional content for the web page for displaying controls for selecting a document managed by the document management service; and producing a document according to selections made through the web page (See col. 7, lines 16-22).

However, Sampson et al teaches generating upon request from a user a web page having content for requesting a web bug from an association service

Lu et al teaches generating, upon request from a user, a web page having content for requesting a web bug from a service (See page 4, paragraph [0059]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Lu et al in the claimed invention of Sampson et al in order to establish and process a cookie right on the client node without additional interaction with the

Art Unit: 2100

web tracking provider (See page 4, paragraph [0064]).

### **(10) Response to Argument**

#### **Ground for Rejection A - Claims 9 and 13-15 rejected under 35 USC 101.**

The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Appellant is seeking to patent functional software as a computer readable medium, however a review of the disclosure reveal that there is intrinsic evidence that the manufacture is intended to cover signals, waves and other items that are not physical articles or objects and /or items which would not be structurally and functionally interconnected to the software in such a manner as to enable the software to act as a computer component and realize any functionality (See page 8, paragraph [0033]) of the disclosure.

#### **Ground For Rejection B - Claims 1, 2, 5, 9-10, 13, 17-18, 20-25 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,490624 to Sampson.**

#### **Claims 1, 9, 17-18 and 24**

The examiner agrees that a) Sampson's cookie is equated with the recited association data b) Sampson's protected web server with the identity service since the Sampson's cookie and protected web server accomplishes the same function as the association data and the identity service of the claimed invention.

Appellant argues that Sampson mentions nothing of using the cookie to identify an identity service that manages resource data. However, Sampson clearly teaches wherein the browser sends a cookie (association data) to a protected web server (identity service) which is a web server with **resources** (See col. 7, lines 64-66). It is well known to one with ordinary skill in the art, as stated by Sampson (See col. 7, lines 56-58) "cookies received from a web server in a specific domain are returned to web servers in that same domain during URL request". Therefore, it would have been obvious that the cookie of Sampson is used to identify the Protected Web server when the user selects a request since the cookie is returned to the web server and is required for access to resources protected by the system (See col. 7, lines 56-66).

Appellant argues that the passage mentions nothing of identifying a resource using resource that resource data. Appellant's disclosure recites "Resource data may include the network address and a description of each resource. It may also include any credentials such as a user name and password needed to access the resource" (See pages 7 and 8, paragraph [0031]). Sampson teaches wherein the Runtime module decrypts information in the cookie and uses it to verify that the user is authorized to access the resource (See col. 7, line 67 and col. 8, lines 1-2).

### **Claims 5 and 13**

As per claims 5 and 13, Appellant argues that Sampson's Session ID is not used to identify an identity service that manages resource data and it is not even used to identify the protected server to which a client is requesting access.

However, as per Appellant's argument regarding claim 1 "A cookie is an example of a session ID". Consequently, the same rationale of claim 1 applies for claim 5. Sampson clearly



Art Unit: 2100

teaches wherein the browser sends a cookie (association data) to a protected web server (identity service) which is a web server with **resources** (See col. 7, lines 64-66). It is well known to one with ordinary skill in the art, as stated by Sampson (See col. 7, lines 56-58) "cookies received from a web server in a specific domain are returned to web servers in that same domain during URL request". Therefore, it would have been obvious that the cookie of Sampson is used to identify the Protected Web server when the user selects a request since the cookie is returned to the web server and is required for access to resources protected by the system (See col. 7, lines 56-66).

### **Claim 19**

As per claim 19, Appellant argues that Sampson fails to teach an association module as that element is recited in claim 19. Furthermore, Appellant argues that Sampson fails to teach "an association module operable to query an association service, supplying a session identifier in order to identify an identity service managing resource data".

However, as per Appellant's argument regarding claim 1 "A cookie is an example of a session ID". Consequently, the same rationale of claim 1 applies for claim 19.

Furthermore, Appellant's disclosure defines the association module as Association module 28 represents generally any programming capable of querying association service 20 (See page 5, paragraph [0024]). Sampson teaches wherein the Runtime (Association module) send a message to the Session Manager (association service) object with which the Runtime is registered. The message request validation between the client and the protected server, and contains information including a **Session identifier** value (See page 13, lines 1-5). Therefore,

Art Unit: 2100

Sampson clearly teaches wherein the session identifier is supplied in order to identify an identity service (protected server) managing resource data since validation and check is performed on the Session Identifier to determine whether the Session Id is recognized or known between the client and the protected server (See col. 13, lines 1-10).

### **Claim 20**

As per claim 20, Appellant argues that Sampson fails to teach "an association module operable to query an association service, supplying a session identifier in order to identify an identity service managing resource data".

However, as per Appellant's argument regarding claim 1 "A cookie is an example of a session ID". Consequently, the same rationale of claim 1 applies for claim 20.

Furthermore, Appellant's disclosure defines the association module as Association module 28 represents generally any programming capable of querying association service 20 (See page 5, paragraph [0024]). Sampson teaches wherein the Runtime (Association module) send a message to the Session Manager (association service) object with which the Runtime is registered. The message request validation between the client and the protected server, and contains information including a **Session identifier** value (See page 13, lines 1-5). Therefore, Sampson clearly teaches wherein the session identifier is supplied in order to identify an identity service (protected server) managing resource data since validation and check is performed on the Session Identifier to determine whether the Session Id is recognized or known between the client and the protected server (See col. 13, lines 1-10).

### **Claim 22**

As per claim 22, Appellant argues that Sampson fails to teach "an association module operable to query an association service, supplying a session identifier in order to identify an identity service managing resource data".

However, as per Appellant 's argument regarding claim 1 " A cookie is an example of a session ID". Consequently, the same rationale of claim 1 applies for claim 22.

Furthermore, Appellant's disclosure defines the association module as Association module 28 represents generally any programming capable of querying association service 20 (See page 5, paragraph [0024]). Sampson teaches wherein the Runtime (Association module) send a message to the Session Manager (association service) object with which the Runtime is registered. The message request validation between the client and the protected server, and contains information including a **Session identifier** value (See page 13, lines 1-5). Therefore, Sampson clearly teaches wherein the session identifier is supplied in order to identify an identify service (protected server) managing resource data since validation and check is performed on the Session Identifier to determine whether the Session Id is recognized or known between the client and the protected server (See col. 13, lines 1-10).

### **Claim 25**

As per claim 25, Appellant argues that Sampson fails to teach a means for querying as that element is recited in claim 25. More particularly, Appellant argues that Sampson fails to teach " a mean for querying, supplying a session identifier, an association service in order to identify an identity service managing resource data".

However, Appellant clearly teaches Sampson teaches wherein the Runtime (Association module) send a message to the Session Manager (association service) object with which the Runtime is registered. The message request (query) validation between the client and the protected server, and contains information including a **Session identifier** value (See page 13, lines 1-5). Therefore, Sampson clearly teaches wherein the session identifier is supplied in order to identify an identify service (protected server) managing resource data since validation and check is performed on the Session Identifier to determine whether the Session Id is recognized or known between the client and the protected server (See col. 13, lines 1-10).

**Grounds for Rejection C - Claims 3 and 11 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,490624 to Sampson et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0074580 to Knouse.**

No arguments were presented.

**Grounds for Rejection D - Claims 4 and 12 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,490624 to Sampson et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0074580 to Knouse and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0015580 to Lu.**

No Arguments were presented.

**Grounds for Rejection C - Claims 6 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0074580 to Knouse in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2004/0015580 to Lu.**

As per claims 6 and 14, Appellant argues that Knouse fails to mention "saving a cookie and an URL in an association table or providing the URL for the web page to query the association table for the cookie in the entry containing the URL".

However, Knouse teaches wherein the subsequent resource requests for resources in domains residing on the same web server are redirected to the preferred host domain, the prior successful authentication for the host domain can be confirmed by the existence of a valid **cookie** (See page 17, paragraph [0207]). Furthermore, Knouse et al teaches clearly teaches wherein the master domain web-server passes authentication cookie to the first domain in the query data portion of the redirection URL (See page 17, paragraph[0209]). Consequently, Knouse et al clearly teaches "saving a cookie and an URL in an association table or providing the URL for the web page to query the association table for the cookie in the entry containing the URL".

Appellant argues that Knouse fails to teach "identifying other entries in the association table containing the cookie.

However, Knouse teaches wherein the subsequent resource requests for resources in domains residing on the same web server are redirected to the preferred host domain, the prior successful authentication for the host domain can be confirmed by the existence of a valid **cookie** (See page 17, paragraph [0207-0209]).

Appellant argues that Knouse fails to teach “identifying from those entries an entry containing an URL for an identification service, the identification service managing resource data”.

However, Knouse teaches when a user successfully authenticates at one of the Web Servers, the Web Gate running on the authenticating Web Server causes the Web Server to return an encrypted cookie, indicating a successful authentication. Subsequent requests by the browser to the domain will pass this cookie (assuming the cookie applies to the requested URL), proving the user's identity; therefore, further authentications are unnecessary (See paragraph [0202-00209]).

**Grounds for Rejection C - Claims 7 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,490,624 to Sampson et al in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0015580 to Lu et al.**

As per claim 7 and 15, Appellant argues that Sampson et al fails to teach a method that includes querying an association service to identify an identity service with which the user is registered by providing an URL for a generated web page.

However, Sampson clearly teaches wherein the browser sends a cookie (association data) to a protected web server (identity service) which is a web server with **resources** (See col. 7, lines 64-66). It is well known to one with ordinary skill in the art, as stated by Sampson (See col. 7, lines 56-58) "cookies received from a web server in a specific domain are returned to web

Art Unit: 2100

servers in that same domain during URL request”. Therefore, it would have been obvious that the cookie of Sampson is used to identify the Protected Web server when the user selects a request since the cookie is returned to the web server and is required for access to resources protected by the system (See col. 7, lines 56-66).

Furthermore, Sampson et al teaches providing an URL for a generated web page by teaching wherein the system presents the User with a Personalized Menu (HTML page) that assists the user in identifying and selecting a resources (See col. 7, lines 16-22).

In Conclusion, Sampson teaches wherein the Runtime (Association module) sends a message to the Session Manager (association service) object with which the Runtime is registered. The message request validation between the client and the protected server, and contains information including a **Session identifier** value (See page 13, lines 1-5). Therefore, Sampson clearly teaches wherein the session identifier is supplied in order to identify an identity service (protected server) managing resource data since validation and check is performed on the Session Identifier to determine whether the Session Id is recognized or known between the client and the protected server (See col. 13, lines 1-10).

#### **(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix**

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner’s answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Art Unit: 2100

Respectfully submitted,

Djenane Bayard

/D. M. B./

Examiner, Art Unit 2141

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144

Conferees:

/William C. Vaughn, Jr./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2144

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2151